DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 218 95 SP 007 958

TITLE The Center for In-Service Education. Final Evaluation Report. Volume II. Part 1.
INSTITUTION Tennessee State Dept. of Education, Nashville.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 82p ; For related document, see SP 007 952

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Inservice Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; Models; *Program Evaluation; *Program Planning

ABSTRACT

This is an overview of the extensive in-service education inventory conducted as an integral portion of the planning contract for Models for In-Service Education supported by the Tennessee State Department of Education under Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The narrative descriptions are free of extensive statistical references to promote both understanding and application of the information derived from the 23 participating school systems. Thirteen of these participating systems were county systems; 10 were special district or city school systems. Information presented for each system includes the number of days allowed for various kinds of in-service programs, provisions for planning and developing in-service programs, judgment of the adequacy of the programs, progress made in programming, self-identified needs, and procedures used for evaluation. Descriptions and evaluations of the 1971 and 1972 Farragut School workshops, training components in a long-range staff development project, conclude the document. (DDO)

ED 090218

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
O.E. (DHEW)
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Volume II Part 1

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

The Center for In-Service Education

Project No. 52-690004-2.1

Funded by Title III
of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Administered by the Tennessee
State Department of Education

An operational grant to implement a Model for In-Service Education for Educational Personnel K-12 in 24 Tennessee school systems—Federal, Area IV

SP001 958

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CISE Evaluation Design Procedures	I - V
Analysis of In-Service Data Pre-Intervention Evaluation	1 - 8
Post-Intervention Evaluation	9 - 11
Teacher Participation - Models For In-Service Education	12
Distribution Of In-Service Days	13
In-Service Programs In Federal Area IV	1 - 31
1971-72 - Farragut Workshop Evaluation	1 - 9a
1972 - Farragut Project Interim Evaluation Report	1 - 21b

CISE EVALUATION DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

PHASE I

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A. DEFINITION OF OPERATIONAL CONTEXT

1. ORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL AREA IV COOPERATIVE COUNCIL

   a. TASK FORCE MET BI-MONTHLY WITH CISE STAFF TO DEFINE SPECIFIC LOCAL PROBLEMS AND OBSTACLES

2. LITERATURE SEARCH AND REVIEW OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS NATION WIDE

B. ASSESS CURRENT STATUS

1. DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF IN-SERVICE ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE AND OPERATION

2. TRAIN SCHOOL SYSTEM STAFF TO ADMINISTER THE INVENTORY

   a. INVOLVEMENT IN AND IDENTIFICATION WITH THE IN-SERVICE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

3. ADMINISTER IN-SERVICE INVENTORY

C. IDENTIFICATION OF SPECIFIC NEEDS IN THE CONTEXT OF IN-SERVICE

1. IN-SERVICE INVENTORY DATA ANALYSIS

2. SCHOOL SITE VISITATION STUDY--ANALYSIS OF TEACHER RESPONSE

   a. DESIGNATION OF A CLEARLY DEFINED TIME FOR CLASSROOM RECORD KEEPING AND A REALLOCATION OF TIME FOR PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

   b. PROCESS CENTERED OR (LABORATORY LEARNING) IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FOCUSING ON PRACTICAL LEARNING EXPERIENCES IMMEDIATELY USE IN THE CLASSROOM

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

   c. MORE TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN IN-SERVICE PLANNING (REINFORCEMENT OF INVENTORY DATA #5)

   d. VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION IN IN-SERVICE EDUCATION WITH SELECTION BASED ON INDIVIDUAL NEEDS AND INTERESTS

   e. GRADE LEVEL, SUBJECT AREA--FREE INTEREST GROUPING FOR IN-SERVICE

   f. INCREASED INTER-COUNTY CONTACT BETWEEN INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL

D. Identify problems underlying needs
   1. In-service inventory data analysis
   2. School site visitation
      A. The intensity of political activity in the school systems geographic region and its impact on school affairs
      B. The impact of the absence of written school board policies regarding instructional personnel
      C. Cultural and religious traditions of a given sub-region
      D. Value systems of the parent group in a given sub-region
      E. General economic factors both real and imaginary
   3. Review status reports and related statistical information from Department of Education

E. Establishment of baseline data
   1. Report of in-service inventory
   2. Dissemination of intermediate analysis to each participating school system
   3. Development of "indices" of current program status - hostility index, T & S comparison tables

PHASE II

A. BOARD FUNDING REQUIREMENTS - GOALS
   1. REVIEW OF COST/UNIT SERVICE INFORMATION OF RSEC
   2. PROJECT COSTS INCREMENTALLY

B. STATE OBJECTIVES IN OPERATIONAL TERMS
   1. INITIAL DRAFT OF PROPOSAL FOR REVIEW BY FEDERAL AREA IV TASK FORCE
   2. REVISION OF OBJECTIVES - VIA TASK FORCE COMMENTS

C. SPECIFY STRATEGY ALTERNATIVE(S)
   1. DEFINITION OF MODEL AS AN ADAPTIVE CONCEPT
   2. COMPONENTS OF MODEL MADE OPTIONAL

D. IDENTIFICATION OF ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES FOR PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION
   1. ESTABLISH MULTI-LEVEL IMPLEMENTATION CONCEPT
      A. MODEL IMPLEMENTATION AS A GUIDE TO PLAN, PROGRAM AND EVALUATE IN-SERVICE AT THE SYSTEM LEVEL
      B. MODEL IMPLEMENTED AS A MEANS OF SPECIFYING AND DEMONSTRATING EXEMPLARY IN-SERVICE METHODS AT THE INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL SITE LEVEL

E. MEASUREMENT DETERMINATION AND DOCUMENTATION PROCEDURES
   1. ADAPTATION OF PROGRAM ANALYSIS AND ASSIGNMENT SYSTEM
   2. DEVELOPMENT OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION INSTRUMENT
   3. REVIEW OF LITERATURE CONCERNING JUDGEMENTAL CRITERIA
      A. STAFF CONFERENCES CONCERNING JUDGEMENTAL EVALUATION

F. ASSESS CAPABILITIES FOR STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Phase III - Operational Evaluation

A. Develop documentation methods
   1. Adaptation of program analysis and assignment system
   2. Evaluation of staff performance materials
   3. Redesign cumulative data assembly and analysis

B. Periodic observation
   1. Staff feedback via PAA materials
   2. Staff conference and seminars to evaluate common problems
   3. Integration of planning information with current observations

C. Maintain records of all events and activities
   1. Program management function
   2. Monthly analysis
   3. Review of critical logistics problems in terms of costs and available staff

D. Data feedback
   1. Dissemination of in-service data via Bulletin
   2. Staff conference and seminars

E. Introspect analysis of program failures or near failures
   1. Program management review of all pertinent information
   2. Identification of program design or recipient defects
   3. General staff review and response or adjustment

Phase IV - Final Evaluation

A. Collection of data from total program
   1. In progress via documentation system
   2. Re-administration of in-service inventory in mid-March
   3. Monthly staff visitation to all participating schools
      a. observational documentation
      b. judgemental evaluation

B. Data analysis
   1. Review of total monthly report data set
   2. Identify needs for additional information
   3. Collect other data pertinent to problem

C. Formal draft of interpretations and recommendations

D. Dissemination of results

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ANALYSIS OF IN-SERVICE DATA AND RELATED INFORMATION

PRE-INTERVENTION EVALUATION

This is an overview of the extensive in-service education inventory, conducted as an integral portion of the planning contract for Models for In-Service Education supported by the State Department of Education, under Title III, ESEA.

The narrative description is free of extensive statistical references to promote both understanding and application of the information derived from the 23 participating school systems. Statistical analysis and tables for the pre- and post-intervention are found in Volume 3 of this final report.

In response to Question 1, present position, location, and type of school system, a general display of anticipated answers was presented. By far, the largest number of respondees are teachers, grades 1-8. Next were school principals, and in a third category, various supervisory positions.

Of the 23 participating school systems, 13 were county systems, while 10 were special district or city school systems. The highest ratio of respondees were in elementary grades 1-8, while the remainder were either at junior high or senior high level.

In response to Question 2, "How much organized planning takes place in your school system relative to in-service education," the general response of teachers indicated some organized planning, with a scale score of 3.5.

Question 3 related to existing in-service grouping of teachers. The general response indicated that the grouping of teachers was by

grade level and that supervisors and/or other administrators met together as a group. There was some indication that the entire school system staff met from time to time, particularly in county school systems.

Question 4 related to the facility in which the in-service programs were regularly held. Libraries, cafeterias, auditoriums, and gymnasiums were listed in that order as the most used location.

Question 5 requested information on pre-school in-service daily schedules. The teachers and supervisors responded uniformly, indicating a full-day session with a luncheon break.

In response to Question 6: "In your system, most of the planning for in-service education is done by:" 78% of the teachers indicated that in-service planning was carried out by principals and supervisors; another 10% indicated supervisors only; while the remaining group indicated 10% by teachers and principals.

Total number of in-service days was asked in Question 7, and here, although contrary to state requirements (10 days), teachers indicated that less than 6 days were scheduled for in-service education. Supervisors, on the contrary, uniformly indicated 10 days.

Question 8 asked for information about time distribution. In-serivce days were distributed as follows: Pre-school in-service had the largest proportion. A distribution of 3, 4, and 5 pre-school days was the most common response. Usually fall, winter, and spring in-service amounted to one day, and post-school, two days. Very little information was gained relative to summer in-service days, since this particular portion of Question 8 was frequently left unanswered.

Summer workshops or conferences (Question 9) are occasionally held by school systems, as indicated by 50% of the teachers. Approximately 50% indicated never having summer workshops.

Attendance at short-term workshops (Question 10) indicated some 70% were compulsory, while 24% were voluntary.

Question 11, "Longer summer institutes or workshops are available to you by your school system," resulted in 30% indicating occasionally, 50% never.

Question 12, "To what degree are summer in-service workshops or institutes attended by your teachers that receive stipends," resulted in an indication by teachers that approximately 20% were attended and were supported.

Question 13 - "How much time is allocated during a school year in-service program for teachers and supervisors to exchange ideas or work on solutions to common problems?" The general indication was little to some on the scale provided.

Question 14 - "Following an in-service education program, how much post-planning or evaluation time is scheduled?" Twenty-eight percent indicated none; forty percent indicated one-half day or less; and thirty percent said one-half day to one day.

Question 15 - "To what degree are students involved in their in-service?" Here again, teachers and supervisors almost uniformly indicated little, if any, involvement.

Question 16 - "Would you like to see more children involved in in-service education activities?" The general response was neutral, indicating no particular desire to involve pupils.

Question 17 - "What is the average travel distance the teacher was committed to in attending various in-service education programs?" In this, the average distance traveled by the majority of teachers was 10 miles. This constituted some 60%, while another 25% indicated 10-20 miles. Eight percent indicated more than 20 miles.

Question 18 - "How much in-service takes place during released classroom time?" This released time was defined as time during regular school sessions when children may or may not be attending school, but the teacher is relieved of instructional responsibility. The teachers uniformly indicated one or two days. Supervisors responded about the same, although there was a slight positive difference.

Question 19 - "During an in-service program, how much opportunity is provided for teachers, supervisors, and/or administrators to become acquainted with the latest materials and methods?" The response was scaled in either hours or days. The teachers answered approximately one day, while two or three was the supervisors' response.

Question 20 - "How much time is allowed for teachers and/or administrators to manipulate and evaluate new material?" The teachers' response was one day. However, supervisors (even though Question 19 and 20 are related) indicated between four and five days were provided for this purpose.

Question 21 - "Which of the following activities generally take place during your in-service program?" The respondees had an opportunity to select a variety of answers listed as passive and active. Over 81.4% of the teachers indicated that listening to speeches or lectures was a principle activity in their present in-service program. However, they had opportunities to check as many as they wished, and here discussion groups scored at approximately the 50% level. Grade level study groups were at the 50% level. System-wide subject area study groups were responded to in particular by the special district or city systems.

Question 22 - "Does your school system regularly use outside consultants?" Here the answer was Yes by some 85% of the respondees.

Question 22.01 (a sub-part of 22) - "Are these consultants paid?" Again, teachers indicated Yes. There were a few that indicated a question mark. Seventy percent of the supervisors indicated Yes.

As an additional sub-part of Question 22, an attempt was made to determine from whence these consultants came. By far, the largest number of consultants serving the schools surveyed came from the University of Tennessee. East Tennessee State University and Carson-Newman were also indicated frequently. It was indicated that insurance salesmen were also frequently present at in-service education, as were educational material salesmen.

Question 23 - "How much additional reinforcement or assistance was provided after the in-service program by various specialists in the school system?" The teachers responded that less than some assistance was provided, with a scale score of 2.6. The supervisors indicated to the contrary with a scale score of 6.8 (considerable follow-up activity).

Question 24 - "As a participant in in-service education, do you find the present plan that is now being employed here to be especially helpful?" Here again, the respondees had an opportunity to use a scale. Most teachers indicated somewhere around the helpful range, although it was below the midpoint. A number of teachers from certain systems also marked the second scale, which went from "uninteresting" to "extremely interesting." Some 64% indicated a score of 2.9 or "less than interesting."

Question 25 - "Which of the following in-service groupings would you prefer?" There was a tendency on the part of the teacher to request subject area or grade level groupings. This was indicated by a heavy response to the question sub-parts 25.01-25.05, which all related to either subject area or grade level groupings. They were not in favor of separate divisions of the teachers by junior and senior high.

Question 26 - "Where would you like to meet for your in-service session?" Emphasis here seemed to be on the classroom. Cafeteria or library were also frequently checked.

Question 27 - "Which of the following in-service schedules would be most appealing to you?" In most cases, teachers and supervisors indicated that they would prefer a full-day session with both a morning and afternoon break.

Question 23 - "Who do you think should do most of the planning for an in-service education program?" (This was another preference question.) Teachers responded heavily to the teacher and principal portion of this question (28.07). Very few teachers responded to superintendents, principals and supervisors, or superintendents and principals. Supervisor response indicated teachers, principals, and supervisors.

Question 29 related to the total number of days the teacher would prefer to see allocated for in-service education programs. There was a wide variation in response. The most remarkable thing about the total response was that almost uniformly, both teachers and supervisors requested fewer days for in-service education than the state minimum.

Question 30 - "How agreeable would you be to an idea of participating in summer workshops or institutes where stipends and expenses would be provided?" Most of the teachers thought this would be okay, which was a 5.0 scale score.

Question 31 - "On what basis do you feel that your participation in institutes should be?" Succinctly, 77% of the teachers responded voluntary, while compulsory attendance had a 10% response; 50% of the supervisors felt it should be compulsory, 50% felt it should be voluntary.

Expenses, under a sub-part of Question 31 was responded to by over 86% as stipend plus milage.

Question 32 - "If summer institutes were available to you as part of your in-service education, which of the following program arrangements would you prefer?" There were three possible answers. The teachers responded to: school system sponsored 2-4 week summer institutes in the subject area with stipend plus milage 60%); 30% indicated interest in short-term conferences or workshops scheduled throughout the school year.

Question 33 - "In your opinion, what percentage of the school systems' total in-service time should be allocated to the exchanging of ideas or working cooperatively with others to work out solutions to common problems?" Teachers here again responded very positively to this question. Sixty-eight percent felt that some time should be spent in this particular manner.

Question 34 - "After participating in what you would consider to be a worthwhile in-service program, how valuable would post-planning or evaluation periods be to you?" Teachers felt that post-planning was very important, scoring 6 on a 0-10 scale. Supervisors felt likewise, scoring closer to 7 on the same scale.

Question 35 - "If the idea of post-planning sessions appeals to you, how much time do you think should be set aside for that?" Teachers indicated 8 hours or one day; supervisors one to two days.

Question 36 - Perhaps some of the most important questions of the total survey were Questions 36 and 38. All were evaluative or preference questions. In short, how did they see the program for the future? Responses to Questions 36 and 38 were used to evaluate to a large extent the type of program activities that the teachers desired in the development of the in-service model.

The cumulative data for these questions is provided in Volume 3 so that they may be reviewed in detail. The comparison of the responses by teachers and supervisors is provided in graphic form in the same volume.

POST-INTERVENTION EVALUATION

A chi-square test was used on each of the first six questions. In each case, the null hypothesis was an even distribution by catagory.

1. Your present position, regardless of subject area, grade level, or title, is primarily related to:

   174 Elementary school (Gr. K-6)
   127 Secondary school (Gr. 7-12).

   The number of elementary school responses was significantly greater at the .001 level.

2. The definition of in-service needs, goals, and/or objectives should be the responsibility of:

   78 Participants in the in-service activity
   35 Supervision (supervisors, principals, department heads, coordinators, etc.)
   175 In-service committee (a conglomerate group consisting of representative supervisors and teachers).

   An in-service committee was the first choice ($p < .001$); participants, the second choice; and supervision, the last choice ($p < .001$).

3. The planning and development of any in-service activity should be the responsibility of:

   72 Participants
   45 Supervisors
   172 In-Service Committee.

   In-service committee was the first choice ($p < .001$); participants, the second; and supervisors, the last choice ($p < .001$).

4. The evaluation of any in-service activity should be the responsibility of:

   221 Participants
   20 Supervisors
   52 In-Service Committee

   The first choice was participants ($p < .001$), the second choice was an in-service committee, and the last choice was supervisors ($p < .001$).

5. Of several currently popular modes of grouping for in-service activities, which of the following do you prefer?

54 Subject area
32 Interest groups
19 Grade level
121 Optional (choice of a number of offerings from the above three areas)
61 Individual (based on a point-index system whereby an individual plots his own professional growth by participating in a choice of activities and receiving points or in-service credits for doing so).

Optional choice was significant as the first choice at the .001 level. Interest groups and grade level groups ranked fourth and fifth respectively with a confidence level of .001.

6. In scheduling in-service activities which of the following times do you prefer?

13 After school sessions
102 Half-day sessions (released time from regular duties)
153 All-day sessions (released time from regular duties)
20 Sessions during the school day (using aides, parents, volunteers, older students for younger, etc.)
2 Saturdays
3 Evenings
10 Summer sessions

The ranking order:
1. All-day sessions
2. Half-day sessions
3. During the school day
4. After school sessions
5. Summer sessions
6. Evenings
7. Saturdays

was significant at the .001 level.

7. How agreeable are you to the idea of having all ten in-service days devoted to staff development if all other school-related duties (planning, report cards, parent conferences, clerical work, etc.) could be done during a regularly scheduled block of time--perhaps one afternoon per week?

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Totals:	19	8	6	7	8	54	23	26	42	31	66

Do not Agree — Very Agreeable

Answers: M = 6.68
σ = 2.92

8. Of what value would an in-service unit or organization (such as the Center for In-Service Education) be to you if through it in-service assistance could be provided on a permanent basis--such as consultive, informational and materials loan services?

Totals:	1	4	10	9	8	40	18	30	49	42	78
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Little Value — Much Value

Answers: M = 7.44
σ = 2.42

Teacher Participants

in Model In-Service Programs*

Month & Year	Elementary School Participants	Secondary School Participants	Total Participants
July, 1970	41	21	62
August, 1970	222	144	366
September, 1970	135	46	181
October, 1970	302	89	391
November, 1970	406	231	637
December, 1970	222	270	492
January, 1971	584	54	638
February, 1971	563	56	619
March, 1971	1151	173	1324
April, 1971	422	140	562
May, 1971	279	51	330
June, 1971	68	14	82
July, 1971	107	64	171
August, 1971	1571	1029	2600
September, 1971	123	30	153
October, 1971	869	279	1148
November, 1971	1171	57	1228
December, 1971	121	99	220
January, 1972	430	419	849
February, 1972	524	109	633
March, 1972	591	46	637
April, 1972	313	120	433
May, 1972	209	77	286
June, 1972	41	10	51
TOTAL	10,465	3,628	14,093

*Exclusive of the Farragut Project

FEDERAL AREA IV SCHOOL SYSTEMS

Distribution of In-Service Days

System	ETEA	Pre-School		Mid-Year		Post-School	
		Individual	Group	Individual	Group	Individual	Group
Alcoa	1	K-6 5 7-12 2½	5 2½		3	1	
Anderson	1		4	1	2	1	
Blount	1	3	2		2	2	
Claiborne	1	1	1	6		1	
Campbell	1	1½	2	2	2	1½	
Clinton	1	3	2			3	1
Grainger	1		4		3	2	
Harriman	1	1	3			3	
Jefferson	1	2	2	4		1	
Knox	1	2	2	2	2	1	
Knoxville	1	1	3	2	2	1	
Lenoir City	1	2	2	1	3	2	
Loudon	1	3	1	1	2	2	
Maryville	1	1	2	1	2	3	
Morgan	1	2	2	2	1	2	
Oneida			3½		2	2	
Oak Ridge	1	2	3	1	1	2	
Roane	1	4		1	1	3	
Robertson							
Rockwood	1	2	2		1	4	
Scott	1	2	5			2	
Sevier	1	2	3		2	2	
Union							

In-Service Programs in Federal Area IV

Pre-CISE

Traditional in-service practices prevailed, consisting mostly of "five days before (preschool), four days behind (postschool), and one day in between (ETEA)!"

Preschool activities usually consisted of signing contracts, getting shots, being briefed by the local insurance man, listening to inspirational speakers (College of Education professors or similar speakers), and occasionally watching an in-service movie or attending a discussion group (grade level or subject area) meeting. The rest of the time was spent "getting ready."

For ETEA day the usual pattern for most teachers was: go to Knoxville, drop in card, take a quick look at materials, pick up samples ("to show the principal so he'll know I've been there!"), go eat lunch and/or leave immediately for the Smokies or to go shopping.

Postschool activity consisted mostly of finishing up everything--report cards, folders, cleaning up and locking the door.

CISE Era

During the Models For In-Service planning period, Federal Area IV school systems regularly sent representatives to the Center where they either took part in planning the in-service Model or expressed their views on certain aspects of the Model. Here, the idea of "a better way to do in-service" began to take form.

As soon as the Evaluative Instrument (questionaire) was sent out, perceptible changes began to take place in several of the more progressive systems--such as duplicating the in-service survey instrument for the system's own assessment. When the operational phase was instituted, Federal Area IV teachers began to attend CISE's "involvement" workshops. Their reactions were usually enthusiastic.

Immediately, the idea of worthwhile in-service practices began to take hold and changes were initiated. Some of the earliest and most obvious were in these systems: Oak Ridge, Jefferson County, Blount County, Knox County, Alcoa City, Maryville City, and Grainger County. During the second year of the operational phase, these systems have continued to develop in-service expertise and have, in some cases, become outstanding. Some of the traditional activities are still around, but they have largely been replaced by more desirable practices based upon the teachers' needs. Other systems, including Anderson County; Scott County; Campbell County; and Roane County, Rockwood and Harriman, didn't show much change last year but are making real progress this year.

One of the ideas in the Model was for the systems to plan and work cooperatively toward better in-service programs. This was quickly adopted by the following systems, which now schedule joint in-service sessions: (1) Rockwood, Roane County, and Harriman; (2) Alcoa, Maryville, and Blount County; and (3) Campbell, Claiborne, Hancock, and Union Counties. For obvious reasons all have expressed satisfaction with the "joining of forces for better in-service."

In a few of the school systems previously mentioned, the development of the in-service Model has progressed to the point that great emphasis is being placed on staff development so that the system can independently carry out its own program--in most cases, using its own people as resource people, instructors, or group leaders. In most of these systems, however, some outside assistance is still welcome and/or needed. In some of the less progressive systems the need for in-service assistance is still critical.

ALCOA's In-Service Program

Calendar

9 days - Preschool (K-6)
4 days - Preschool (7-12)
1 day - ETEA
3 days - all day inter-system workshops
2 days - scheduled via weekly meetings in schools
(plus) (inter-system also)

Planning

A Steering Committee (superintendent, supervisor, principals) directly supervises the program.

How Adequate

In our opinion; their in-service is very adequate!

Self-Identified Needs

To develop a comprehensive individualized program in all elementary schools.

To develop positive teacher attitudes toward the individualized instruction program.

To develop teacher competency in all areas, including the ability to develop individualized instructional materials.

To improve quality of secondary instruction.

Progress

K-6 teachers are scheduled for a minimum of 15 in-service days per year. For the past two years they have had 9 days of pre-school in-service with much of the time spent in group meetings planning the new program or developing instructional materials to be used in the program.

Two mid-year all day in-service days in 1971-1972 were joint ventures with Blount and Maryville teachers (K-12). The same is planned for 1972-1973.

Grades 7-12 teachers put in a minimum of 10 days--also with weekly meetings in subject areas. Blount and Maryville secondary teachers can and do attend these meetings. Here, the main thrust seems to be the development of teacher competency in subject areas, with talk of individualizing some areas.

Who Plans, Develops, and Participates

The Steering Committee plans and supervises. In-service needs are identified through conferences with principals, department heads, and teachers. Staff committees at each school are responsible for some planning and developing certain activities.

Evaluation Procedures

Oral

Questionaire (brief) on inter-system (Alcoa, Blount, and Maryville) activities.

ANDERSON COUNTY's In-Service Program

Calendar

4 days - Preschool
1 day - ETEA
3 days - (Other dates)
2 days - Postschool

Planning

Supervisory staff together with a planning and coordinating committee of teachers from each Anderson County school are responsible for planning in-service activities.

How Adequate

Appears to offer ample opportunities for teachers to have a voice in planning the program. In addition to having building representatives on the in-service committee, teachers are asked to submit their ideas and to make suggestions for future in-service activities.

Self-Identified Needs

To improve content teaching through the development of courses of study for each subject area.

To help teachers to a better understanding of the individual differences of children from K-6.

Progress

Courses of study in many areas completed or revised as part of professional growth activities.

Teachers actively involved in many different programs having to do with various plans of flexible grouping for the purpose of providing for individual differences of children.

Teachers in four schools involved in a specific study and understanding of continuous progress plans.

Teacher exchange between and within departments in secondary schools.

An overall orientation for staff members for a more meaningful and effective curriculum for the mentally and culturally disadvantaged student.

Who Plans, Develops, Participates

Obviously, much of the planning is done by the teachers.
Example: Those involved in curriculum development (courses of study), study of various plans of grouping, teacher visitation and exchange within their own system and in other systems.

The overall planning is done by supervisory staff and a co-ordinating committee (teachers from each school). Outside consultants (University and CISE staff) are used.

Evaluation Procedures

Verbal

BLOUNT COUNTY's In-Service Program

Calendar

5 days - Preschool
1 day - ETEA
2 days - Other dates
2 days - Postschool

Planning

The overall planning is done by supervisors and principals with the superintendent's approval. Suggestions for specific in-service needs are fed to supervisors by teachers and the requests are carefully considered.

Self-Identified Needs

To work toward individualization in some schools and in some areas.

To develop teacher competency.

To foster communication between secondary teachers through inter-school planning.

To increase the flow of ideas between teachers through joint in-service programs with two other systems.

To improve the quality of secondary education through weekly planning and in-service sessions (after school), using their own teachers or teachers from Alcoa and Maryville as group leaders (subject area groups).

Progress

Tri-system (Alcoa, Maryville, and Blount County) in-service meetings all year (after school for some teacher groups).

Special emphasis on kindergarten program and kindergarten teacher study groups (tri-system).

"Other dates" used for tri-system programs (two days during 1971-1972).

Frequent discussion meetings between supervisor and selected groups of teachers to identify specific needs (credit this to the aggressive problem-solving approach exemplified by Mrs. McConnell.

Evaluation Procedures

Verbal - mostly between teachers and supervisors and/or principals.

Written - after inter-system workshops.

CAMPBELL COUNTY's In-Service Program

Calendar

4 1/2 days - Preschool
2 days - Other dates
1 day - ETEA
3 days - Other dates
1 1/2 days - Postschool

Planning

Campbell County belongs to the Clinch-Powell Valley Co-op. The four counties (Hancock, Campbell, Claiborne, and Union), along with U. T. staff, have a planning and advisory committee that is charged with responsibility for planning the overall program for the four counties, as well as detailing those days when all four counties jointly participate. In addition, Campbell County has its own in-service committee composed of supervisors, some principals and teachers. These people plan for special group meetings to be held for Campbell County teachers only.

How Adequate

According to Bill Stiner, the planning is adequate. Teachers are in on a bit of the planning; at least, they can make suggestions to their building representative and are able to choose between a number of activities via the Point Index System.

Self-Identified Needs

To get teachers ready for the new consolidated high school at Jacksboro.

Two junior high schools; all elementary schools to be K-6.

Progress

Teachers may attend any group meetings scheduled. They are informed of them via a monthly newsletter (from Co-op) as to what is scheduled and where. A number of other activities are offered such as travel, cultural activities, student teaching, ETV, educational reading, professional meetings, group activities (workshops, conferences, and study groups). Some Morgan County teachers plan, develop, and provide leadership for the program.

Evaluation Procedures

Oral and written

Comments

Bill Stiner indicated that the point system isn't perfect and needs working on, but he said that he thought the teachers did as much under this as any other system they had tried.

CLINTON's In-Service Program

Calendar

5 days - Preschool
1 day - ETEA
4 days - In-service

Planning

We weren't able to obtain information on their planning procedures.

Comments

The preliminary planning meeting was set up by Flossie Rule (see attached sheet). No follow-up meetings took place because of the obvious disinterest of those administrators responsible for planning in-service.

Mr. Flatt reports no further contacts or requests for assistance from Clinton during this year.

GRAINGER COUNTY's In-Service Program

Calendar

5 days - Preschool
3 days - Other dates
2 days - Postschool

Planning

Mrs. Gertrude Bartlette, supervisor, is responsible for overall planning. The high school principals, Ronnie Cabage (Rutledge High) and R. B. Caffey (Washburn High), do some in-service planning with their teachers--provided they work closely with Mrs. Bartlette and get her approval. In 1971-1972 Mrs. Bartlette and Flossie Rule (CISE) planned the preschool program (see "Comments").

How Adequate

Not very--but better than before. Use of CISE staff has been extensive both last year and this year. Most teachers consider this to be a welcome change. However, more teachers need to be in on defining the system's needs and planning the programs.

Self-Identified Needs (Mrs. Bartlette)

Upgrading basic teaching skills (methods). Teachers, Mr. Acuff, and Mrs. Bartlette all agree that the teaching demonstrations by CISE staff were the most worthwhile activities we've done there yet. Their comments were, "The material being presented was of lesser importance than the techniques used to present it."

Progress

The use of CISE staff this year to do demonstration teaching as a type of in-service activity--teachers and Mrs. Bartlette have served notice that they are pleased and expect more of the same next year!

Evaluation Procedure

Practically nil. If Mrs. Bartlette asks, she gets a "proper" answer.

Comments

Not too much communication apparent between teachers and supervisor.

The preschool in-service did not utilize any of the Center's services other than Flossie Rule's, since most were committed elsewhere. Mr. Acuff wanted Grainger County teachers to watch SDE's ETV in-service programs. This consumed 2 1/2 days; one day was devoted to group activity, and one day was spent in individual activity (rooms). The three days during the year were scheduled as afternoon workshops with CISE staff. Two days of postschool in-service are planned for closing out records, etc.

HARRIMAN's In-Service Program

Calendar

4 days - Preschool
3 days - Other dates
3 days - Postschool

Planning

An in-service committee composed of supervisor, principals, and teacher representatives from each school plan the program.

How Adequate

Norman Clay, supervisor, seems pleased with both last year's and this year's in-service program.

Self-Identified Needs

More planning time for teachers to work together.

Development of a continuous progress plan in seventh and eighth.

Progress

They are thinking about going to a Wednesday afternoon system of in-service (similar to Oak Ridge).

Evaluation Procedure

At the end of the school year all teachers are asked to submit an evaluation of the current year's in-service and also to make suggestions for the next year.

Comments

Harriman's preschool in-service is four days: One half day is scheduled for group activity (speakers). The other 3 1/2 days are spent in the individual schools, and throughout this week Mr. Clay meets with different groups of teachers. Three other days throughout the year are spent as follows: one day joint program with Roane County and Rockwood, one day group meetings (workshops), and one day after school group meetings. The three days of postschool are spent on closing records and group and individual planning.

JEFFERSON COUNTY's In-Service Program

Calendar

4 days - Preschool
4 days - Other dates
1 day - ETEA
1 day - Postschool

Planning

Supervisor does overall planning after conferring with principals in regard to in-service needs. Teachers have a number of activities to choose from. This year's offerings were a number of workshops by CISE staff, a concert and lecture series, ETV, or a couple of in-service workshops put on by personnel of KC or UT.

How Adequate

Ken Thornton feels it's the best Jefferson County has ever had. He plans to use somewhat the same format next year.

Self-Identified Needs

Improved scheduling for in-service--Ken Thornton doesn't like the after-school sessions and hopes to go to Wednesday afternoon scheduling for in-service.

Progress

Ken Thornton requested that we send whatever information is available on Oak Ridge's system (specific items such as time school begins and ends, etc.) so that he can confer with J. Horner next week to get permission to try the same.

Who Plans, Develops, Participates

Apparently, most of the in-service planning is done by the supervisor. Most of the group in-service activities (1971-1972) have been scheduled through CISE; and, of course, the teachers can choose among the activities and get in-service credit.

Evaluation Procedures

Apparently, supervisor gets plenty of feedback (probably verbal) via teachers and principals as to which in-service sessions seemed most worthwhile.

Comments

4 days perschool - One day is a group meeting with speakers. The other three are spent on individual activities (mostly watching ETV or working in individual schools).

Comments (continued)

4 days throughout the year - Teachers choose between a number of activities and receive in-service credit.

1 day ETEA

1 day postschool - Spent in individual schools.

KNOX COUNTY's In-Service Program

Calendar

4 days - Preschool
1 day - ETEA
2 days - Individual schools
2 days - Group
1 day - Postschool

Planning

The overall program is planned by supervisors who consult with principals. Teachers are free to express their needs, desires, ideas, or suggestions to either supervisors or principals. These ideas are incorporated into the program if possible. Individual school activity is planned by principals and/or teachers.

How Adequate

The program seems to meet their needs, and a lot of good and worthwhile in-service activities seem to be in progress.

Self-Identified Needs

Expansion of open schools concept.

Expansion of individualized instruction program.

Modification of teacher attitudes in regard to adopting the above programs in some schools.

Generally upgrading Knox County schools and teachers.

Progress

Knox County's in-service program is much better now than three years ago. The idea of "teacher involvement" has caught on and most in-service consists of "work-type" activities. Those responsible for planning the in-service have planned it for "practicability" and "meeting designated needs" (whether supervisor, principal or teachers have identified these needs is not clear).

Evaluation Procedures

Probably verbal.

KNOXVILLE's In-Service Program

Calendar

4 days - Preschool
4 days - Other dates
1 day - ETEA
1 day - Postschool

Planning

An in-service committee is responsible for overall planning. The supervisor works closely with this group, and the principals are in on all planning that involves their particular staff. Some schools do most of their own planning for the "4 days - other dates" when the activities are in the individual schools.

How Adequate

Seems to be adequate.

Self-Identified Needs

To bring all schools up to par with some of the newer and more progressive (program-wise) schools.

Progress

Progress seems to be good. Teachers have access to all UT has to offer.

Evaluation Procedures

Probably none, unless verbal feedback comes from teachers to principals.

LENOIR CITY's In-Service Program

Calendar

4 days - Preschool
1 day - ETEA
1 day - TEA
2 days - Other dates
2 days - Postschool

Planning

Evidently done by supervisor (group meetings) and by principals (individual schools).

How Adequate

Not very--note topics below:

1. Dropouts, school board policies, narcotics
2. Group dynamics - UT
3. Individual schools
4. Registration
5. Parent Teacher Conferences
6. ETEA
7. Evaluation of pupil progress
8. TEA
9. Evaluation of pupil progress
10. Evaluation of pupil progress

Self-Identified Needs

Upgrading schools to TVA's specifications.

Progress

Teachers do a lot of in-school activity according to the calendar. How much of this is devoted to professional growth is unknown. Seems that most of the program is traditional.

Dr. Ross Wilson is now superintendent, and Morgan County has a fairly good in-service program. Maybe Lenoir City's will change a bit next year.

Harold Duff brought a group of Lenoir City teachers to the Center in January for an all-day workshop.

Evaluation Procedure

None apparent

LOUDON COUNTY's In-Service Program

Calendar

4 days - Preschool
1 day - ETEA
1 day - TEA
2 days - Other dates
2 days - Postschool

Planning

Mostly done by supervisor and/or principals.

How Adequate

Much in-service time is spent in the individual schools and is probably spent with teachers working individually.

Self-Identified Needs

Upgrade schools (curriculum-wise).

Upgrade teacher competency in whole system.

Initiate new programs (ungrading and individualizing).

Progress

Evaluation Procedures

Feedback from teachers to principals.

MARYVILLE's In-Service Program

Calendar

3 days - Preschool
3 days - Other dates
1 day - ETEA
3 days - Postschool

Planning

An in-service committee composed of supervisors and selected teachers and principals for the tri-systems (Alcoa, Maryville, and Blount County) plans for two in-service days during the year. (These people plan in conjunction with the other two systems.)

For Maryville's 1971 preschool in-service, the whole three days consisted of opening exercises, work in individual schools, school faculty meetings, watching ETV. This obviously was planned by supervision.

How Adequate

The two days of tri-system in-service activity based on the option in-service plan seems to be adequate. Many of Maryville's capable teachers head the various tri-system's study groups throughout the year and often act as instructors for specific workshops. The preschool planning wasn't much (in my opinion) this year, unless worthwhile planning took place in individual schools during faculty meetings or elsewhere.

During the school year there is time allocation for after school in-service (secondary level) with subject area meetings and study groups scheduled. Obviously, these groups do their own planning.

Teachers fill out forms specifying their own in-service needs and submit them to Stewart McNeil, supervisor. These are either okayed or considered for tri-system in-service programs.

Apparently, the last three days (postschool) are used for individual teacher activity or group meetings in the schools.

Self-Identified Needs

Work toward open school idea, individualized instruction, developing materials for individualizing instruction, changing teachers' attitudes toward team teaching, individualizing, etc.

Progress

There is close cooperation between supervisors in Alcoa, Blount County, and Maryville. Because of the obvious excellence of Alcoa and Maryville schools, there must be good things going on, plenty of ideas flowing back and forth between teachers and supervisors. Probably the biggest in-service step forward for Blount County, Maryville and Alcoa is the inter-planning between secondary teachers and between supervisors, principals, and smaller in-service groups for the two joint in-service days.

Evaluation Procedures

Verbal, if solicited; however, written evaluation forms are used for the two option in-service days.

MORGAN COUNTY's In-Service Program

Calendar

4 days - Preschool
1 day - ETEA
3 days - Other dates
2 days - Postschool

Planning

An in-service committee (principals and teachers) met in the spring with Mrs. England, the supervisor, to make recommendations for next year's calendar and to do preliminary planning for the program. This group continues to meet when necessary to do more detailed planning; however, some is done entirely by the supervisor with the approval of the superintendent.

How Adequate

Mrs. England feels the plan is working much better than previous in-service programs have. She would like to see more mid-year days devoted to group activity on a county-wide basis rather than two days spent in individual schools.

Self-Identified Needs

General upgrading of basic teaching skills.

Changing teacher attitudes toward new trends (continuous progress plans, etc.)

Progress

Use of many consultants--CISE staff, University staff, the Co-op and an extensive student teacher program from UT.

Evaluation Procedures

Mostly verbal--Mrs. England, the supervisor, actively seeks teacher and principal evaluation.

Comments

During my last conversation with Mrs. England, she voiced hope that Morgan County could team up with Anderson and/or Oak Ridge, or Roane, Rockwood and Harriman for in-service programs. I suggested that, if this should not work out, perhaps she might try for special subject areas where they have so few teachers (business education, home economics, music, etc.). Of course, this idea will have to be okayed by Mr. Human, the superintendent.

Comments (continued)

Two days of perschool in-service are group activities (speakers, workshops, etc.), and the other two days of preschool in-service are spent in the schools. The remaining in-service is broken up as follows: one day ETEA, one county-wide group in-service day, two mid-year days in individual schools, and two days postschool (individual activity).

OAK RIDGE's In-Service Program

Calendar

5 days - Preschool
1 day - ETEA
2 days - Wednesday afternoons
2 days - Postschool

Planning

A coordinating (in-service) committee, composed of assistant superintendent, reserach assistant (who is responsible for seeing that the in-service program is carried out), two principals, and three teachers, is responsible for much of the planning. For the individual school staffs, however, all planning is done by teachers and/or principals.

How Adequate

Appears to be adequate

Self-Identified Needs

To continue progress with open school concept (continuous progress plans).

To keep new educational ideas and programs flowing into the curriculum.

To update methods for older teachers.

To promote individualization of instruction in all schools as much as possible.

Progress

The Oak Ridge school system has recently established a reputation for having an excellent in-service program. Much of the success appears to have come about as a result of allowing the teachers to assume much of the responsibility for their own in-service (not only planning but also executing). Last year the Oak Ridge schools had one "option day" with varied workshops to choose from. Wednesday afternoons are devoted to teacher planning in-school activity as well as in-service activity. Preschool in-service is about half group (including speakers) and half individual activity. Postschool is practically all individual.

Evaluation Procedures

Probably plenty--Oak Ridge teachers are both critical and verbal.

ONEIDA's In-Service Program

Calendar

5 days - Preschool
1 day - ETEA
2 days - After school sessions
2 days - Postschool

Planning

The supervisor and superintendent do most of the in-service planning. With Oneida's small system and the compact physical set-up, however, teachers are in close touch with both men daily. Their ideas and suggestions are listened to and incorporated into the planning if possible.

How Adequate

As well as could be expected. Supervisor reports that most teachers view in-service as a repugnant activity and few project any ideas. Some of the younger teachers, however, seem to have a bit of enthusiasm for professional growth.

Self-Identified Needs

General upgrading of teaching methods.

Changing teachers' attitudes toward trying out new ideas in the classroom.

Progress

Evaluation Procedures

Verbal - Teachers don't hesitate to express opinions to both John Thompson and Mr. Jacobs.

Comments

John Roy Thompson seems to be constantly searching for new ideas for making Oneida's schools better.

Preschool in-service is 3 1/2 days group activity and 1 1/2 days individual activity.

ROANE COUNTY's In-Service Program

Calendar

4 days - Preschool
1 day - In individual schools
1 day - ETEA
1 day - Combined in-service (with Rockwood and Harriman)
3 days - Postschool

Planning

Mostly by Willard Crouch, supervisor of instruction, and principals.

How Adequate

All preschool in-service takes place in the schools, so any in-service activity must be planned either by the principal and/or the teacher. Most of the three-day program is devoted to individual teacher activity and/or program planning for that school.

The tri-system day (March) is well planned. Themes to be covered are "Humanizing Education" and "Flexible Scheduling" (speaker followed by group activity).

Self-Identified Needs

Preparation of elementary teachers for introduction of non-grading.

Preparation of high school teachers for flexible scheduling.

Progress

In the summer of 1971 teachers of Oliver Springs and Midtown Elementary schools participated in a six-week workshop designed to prepare them for the nongraded program to be introduced in the two schools in the fall.

Evaluation Procedures

None apparent.

Comments

Most in-service activity during the school year appears to take place in the separate schools.

There seems to be a fair amount of communication and ideas flowing between Rockwood, Harriman, and Roane County systems, both on a supervisory level (the supervisors and principals of all three systems meet) and on a teacher level (at least during the one day planned jointly).

ROCKWOOD's In-Service Program

Calendar

3 days - Preschool
2 days - Other dates
1 day - ETEA
4 days - Postschool

Planning

Very similar to Harriman and Roane County, only here the superintendent (Clarence Byrd) takes an active interest in the in-service program and helps to do much of the planning.

How Adequate

Better than some.

Self-Identified Needs

To continue expanding and improving the nongraded, individualized program.

To improve teacher attitudes toward this program.

To bring new ideas into focus.

To improve teacher competency (in methods, etc.)

Progress

Clarence Byrd seems to be an aggressive administrator and is well informed as to how a good school system should go. The teachers seem to have a certain amount of freedom in planning their in-service program. Mr. Byrd listens to them and they speak freely to him.

Evaluation Procedures

Verbal

SCOTT COUNTY's In-Service Program

Calendar

7 days - Preschool
1 day - ETEA
2 days - Postschool

Planning

Mostly by supervisor (Mr. Culver). Principals may be included in some planning, but it is highly unlikely that teachers are consulted.

Self-Identified Needs

To develop teacher competency in all areas and on all levels.

To individualize instruction in the new high school.

To change teacher attitudes toward individualization and ungrading.

To take initial steps toward studying and adapting some form of continuous progress plan in the elementary schools.

To work for certification of all teachers through college course work scheduled specifically for Scott County teachers.

Progress

The long (7-day) preschool workshop had some interesting group sessions such as:

reaction and interaction groups on problem solving,
the ungraded classroom,
team teaching,
teacher planning for the open classroom,
material needs identification,
responses to a problem (Responsibility Inventory designed by Mr. Culver)

Reaction group leaders mostly picked from Scott County personnel.

CISE workshops in most subject areas.

Testing Procedures workshop by State Department of Education.

Evaluation Procedures

If solicited at all, evaluations are probably verbal.

SEVIER COUNTY's In-Service Program

Calendar

8 days - Preschool (teachers over 60 years of age)
4 days - Preschool (all other teachers)
1 day - ETEA
2 days - Other dates
3 days - Postschool

Planning

Apparently, Mr. Tarwater is responsible for most of the planning except that held in the individual schools. Here, either the principal and/or the teachers do whatever is done. The preschool planning for 1971-1972 was done by L. Tarwater and Flossie Rule (CISE).

How Adequate

Not very, according to comments heard during the preschool workshops. Teachers don't seem to have a voice in any planning and are suspect if they try anything new or seem to want to usurp the authority of the one responsible for planning the in-service. It appears that the teachers are considerably frustrated and rather apathetic to the whole idea of in-service. On the whole, however, they seemed pleased with the CISE preschool activities.

Self-Identified Needs

Certification of all teachers.

General upgrading of basic teaching techniques (methods).

Progress

UT extension classes scheduled throughout the year at Sevier County High School. Teachers receive credit toward certification.

Teachers over 60 go five days earlier in August for workshops with emphasis on basic subject area ideas.

Evaluation Procedure

None apparent

Comments

During an afternoon preschool session with Grades 4-6 teachers, I suggested that they organize and plan their own in-service programs. (Please see attached sheet.) This they did. Whether this group was allowed to function or was promptly throttled is not known.

Comments (continued)

Only one of the preschool days was spent in individual schools. All in-service activities were planned and carried out by CISE staff with the exception of Title I reading teachers and aides. These were in a State Department of Education workshop (UT personnel).

Sevier County School System

DATE: August 25, 1971

SUBJECT: The formation of an in-service planning committee composed of a teacher representative from three grade levels--four, five and six--in each of the thirteen elementary schools. (This committee could be known as the Sevier County In-Service Planning Committee or SCIPC, which when sounded phonetically comes out SKIPS Committee.)

PURPOSE: The purpose of SCIPC is to work closely with the administrative staff in formulating meaningful in-service programs for the teachers. More specifically, the responsibilities of this committee are:

1. To establish direct lines of communication from the teachers in grades 4-6 to the administration.

2. To work with the administration in gathering data and assessing in-service needs in grades 4-6 on an individual school and a county-wide basis.

3. To determine priority of needs followed by planning for in-service activities.

4. To determine who can best plan and conduct a specific in-service program and to contact that person or persons.

5. To meet on a regular basis as a group for the purpose of exchanging ideas and information and determining appropriate courses of action to take in developing meaningful in-service programs.

THE 1971-72 FARRAGUT WORKSHOP EVALUATION

The workshop was conducted at the Farragut School (grades 1-12) as the initial training component of a long range staff development project. The general areas of program content provided were: (1) the study of basic human relations, (2) organization and roles of individuals within organizations, (3) curriculum, (4) instructional strategies, and (5) related problems identified through earlier extensive planning sessions with the Farragut faculty.

A full year of intensive preparation involving the Farragut staff was completed prior to the beginning of the two-week workshop in staff development. The following is an overview of the project.

As indicated the two-week summer workshop for the Farragut School was projected as an intensive beginning of a two- to three-year in-service project. It was different in that:

(1) it involved a full-time joint appointment between the Knox County Public Schools and the College of Education, The University of Tennessee. A Field teacher educator will have the responsibility for pre- and in-service teacher education and program development in Farragut School;

(2) the public school and the College have made a two- to three-year commitment to this school center for intensive in-service efforts, designed to bring about major program changes;

(3) the plan incorporates the use of pre-service students in a differentiated staffing pattern; and

(4) the program is designed to have multiple beneficial effects for the public school, the Center for In-Service Education, and the University staff involved.

Prior to the workshop a total of thirty-five university and twenty-five supervisory days were spent in the Farragut School. In addition, two

one-half day in-service meetings of the Farragut staff were devoted to planning.

Purposes. Major purposes of the workshop and subsequent activities included:

1. Study of Organizations. Designed to examine institutions, goals, norms, and individuals in organizations including human relations, individual needs, roles and self worth. Developed in response to such questions as "What is the role of Farragut Schools in a complex, dynamic society?" and "Who am I in this particular organization?"
2. Curriculum and Instruction. Designed to develop understanding of curriculum theory including (a) curriculum planning (specific goals of school); (b) curriculum design (exploring alternative ways of organizing the school to meet its goals); (c) instruction (examination of alternative instructional strategies and alternative roles of the classroom teacher); and evaluation (of process, of product).
3. Specific Task Areas. Farragut teachers were involved in a problem-identification session. Numerous task-area studies were implemented as a result of synthesis and evaluation of the problems identified by the teachers. Areas which were identified include: concerns for teaching specific content, i.e., reading, math, science; and concerns for certain processes, i.e., multi-media instruction, discipline, differentiated staffing, and various forms of individualization (independent study, nongrading, learning packets, etc.).

The workshop was the beginning of an ongoing study of the above mentioned areas to progress for a three- to four-year period. It was aimed at both process, content development, and development of the human relations dimension, as well as programmatic development. A diverse instructional format was implemented, ranging from large group to small group instruction, to idependent study. The objectives related to organizations and curriculum included all participants. Beyond that, individual or small group problems were addressed. The focus in each of these activities was upon knowledge, attitudes, etc., as applied to the Farragut Schools situation, its program, its pupils, and its staff.

Each day's schedule included:

1. Large Group Session. Devoted to the study of and activities related to organizations, curriculum and instruction.
2. Specific Task Areas. Small groups organized to examine specific problems identified in an earlier in-service program.
3. Brown-Bag Interaction Groups. Time for interaction across program- or grade-level lines about any aspect of the school; independent study and renewal time.
4. Synthesis Evaluation. Daily critical thinking in summary of activities and ideas of the day; a pulling together of bits and pieces so that relationships are clear.

Much of the last two days of the workshop were devoted to exploring next steps in the total development of the Farragut Schools and in examining ways of organizing for continuation of the activities begun in the workshop.

There were seventy-eight out of over 100 teachers participating in the workshop. Nineteen consultants were involved during the two-week period. As indicated earlier the first two days were general sessions involving the study of curriculum and human relations. These sessions were led by Dr. E. Dale Doak and Dr. Jerry Bellon. The participants indicated that the consultants were knowledgeable of subject matter and ability to communicate their knowledge to the participant. The participants also indicated that the material presented was useful. Although these sessions were mostly lecture, the participants felt they were helpful and necessary.

The role of Dr. Kenneth Jenkins was to help the secondary see alternative methods of presenting subject matter to students. He was rated very high in regard to knowledge of subject matter and communication. Dr. Jenkins' approach and manner helped some teachers to begin thinking about a different approach in working with secondary students. His willingness to work with others and material presented was most helpful.

Dr. Ron McIntire's role as a consultant was to help elementary teachers see alternative ways of working with students. Here again, the participants rated the consultant as high in the area of knowledge of subject matter and ability to communicate.

Mr. Walter Smith worked in the area of curriculum development. This was a lecture type presentation for the total group. It was rated excellent in all areas. Participants felt he was most helpful.

The special consultants were highly successful in getting the Farragut staff off dead center. They presented many excellent approaches and helped the staff pursue some alternatives of their own.

Comments which were made by teachers concerning the special consultants were:

"He made me look at what I was doing to children."

"Good reinforcement."

"I wanted to do something different, but felt unsure until today."

"Stimulating."

"I'm ready to start tomorrow."

Along with the special consultants there were other consultants who worked in special group sessions conducted during the middle seven days (see schedule). There were six areas involved each day. Dr. Russell French worked in the area of "Evaluation of Student Progress;" Dr. Robert Williams worked in the area of "Student Behavior or Behavioral Modification;" "Student Teaching" was handled by Dr. William Butefish; Dr. Leonard Breen with "Reading, Diagnosing and Skill Sequence;" and Dr. Everett Myer in the area of "Staff Utilization." One of the six areas studied daily was "Materials Development." There were seven different consultants used for these task area sessions. Dr. Kamala Anandam in the area of contracts; Mrs. Louise Chamberlain and Mrs. Brenda Smith worked with language arts; Dr. Charles Chance helped with independent study programs; Dr. A. M. Johnston in individualized study plans; Mr. Carl Ross presented the learning center approach and Mr. Bill LaForge helped teachers with the development of teacher made materials.

These were all organized as sessions to begin working on change and materials and not to develop a final product. All sessions met this objective. The major objective of the two-week workshop was to initiate a long-range staff development project for the Farragut campus. This

objective was met. The consultants stimulated the thinking and in many instances helped the staff make changes. As indicated this was a beginning and the true impact of the two-week workshop can only be determined as the project develops over the next three years.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) is a 64-item questionnaire developed by Andrew W. Haplin and Don B. Croft as a measure of the relationships and interactions between teachers and their principals. The test contains eight subtests: four describing the perceived behavior of teachers and four describing the perceived behavior of their principals. From these subtests, eight relatively independent indices are derived. The four indices of teacher behavior are Disengagement, Hindrance, Espirit and Intimacy. The four indices of principals' behavior are Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust and Considëration. From patterns across these eight indices, a school's climate can be labeled as either Open, Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar, Paternal or Closed.

During the Farragut Teacher's Workshop (summer, 1971), the OCDQ was administered on the first and the last day of the workshop. A preliminary analysis of the data showed no significant differences between the two test administrations. This lack of a significant difference was not surprising since the time between the two administrations was so short and the goals of the workshop were more "long-term" than "short-term." Furthermore, the questionnaire is a more gross measure of organizational climate and is probably not sensitive to the changes brought

about by a two-week workshop. However, the test was administered a third time in early June, 1972. These data are now being analyzed and are being compared to the first two administrations of the questionnaire. The comparative analysis will be forwarded as a supplementary report within the next few weeks.

MONDAY, JULY 26	TUESDAY, JULY 27	WEDNESDAY, JULY 28	THURSDAY, JULY 29	FRIDAY, JULY 30
8:00--1st General Session (Introductions, Orientation, Evaluation Instruments) 9:45--BREAK 10:00--2nd General Session (Curriculum, Human Relations, Instruction) 11:45--BREAK 12:00--3rd General Session (Curriculum, Human Relations, Instruction) 2:00--REGISTRATION	8:00--Speaker: Dr. Kenneth Jenkins 9:45--BREAK 10:00--Special Group Sessions: *Primary:* *Middle:* *4th-5th:* *Secondary: Jenkins* 11:45--BREAK 12:00--Special Group Sessions (same as 10:00 session) 2:00--ADJOURNMENT	8:00--Speaker: Dr. Ron McIntire 9:45--BREAK 10:00--Special Task Areas (see Task Area Schedule) 11:45--BREAK 12:00--Grade Level Meetings *Primary: McIntire* *4th-5th: Bellon/Chance* *Middle: Bellon/Chance* *Secondary: Doak/French* 2:00--ADJOURNMENT	8:00--Speaker: Mr. Walter Smith 9:45--BREAK 10:00--Special Task Areas 11:45--BREAK 12:00--Grade Level Meetings *Primary: McIntire* *4th-5th: Bellon/Chance* *Middle: Bellon/Chance* *Secondary: Smith* 2:00--ADJOURNMENT	8:00--4th General Session: Films (elementary and secondary) 9:45--BREAK 10:00--Special Task Areas 11:45--BREAK 12:00--Grade Level Meetings: *Primary: French* *4th-5th: Bellon/Chance* *Middle: Bellon/Chance* *Secondary: Smith* 2:00--ADJOURNMENT
MONDAY, AUGUST 2	TUESDAY, AUGUST 3	WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4	THURSDAY, AUGUST 5	FRIDAY, AUGUST 6
8:00--5th General Session: Film "High School" 9:45--BREAK 10:00--Special Task Areas 11:45--BREAK 12:00--Grade Level Meetings 2:00--ADJOURNMENT	8:00--6th General Session: continued development of curriculum, human relations, instruction) 9:45--BREAK 10:00--Special Task Areas 11:45--BREAK 12:00--Grade Level Meetings 2:00--ADJOURNMENT	8:00--7th General Session (same as 6th General Session) 9:45--BREAK 10:00--Special Task Areas 11:45--BREAK 12:00--Grade Level Meetings 2:00--ADJOURNMENT	8:00-- PLANNING FOR INSERVICE ACTIVITIES FOR 1971-72 SCHOOL YEAR 2:00--ADJOURNMENT	8:00-- 2:00--ADJOURNMENT

SPECIAL TASK AREA SESSIONS

Wednesday, July 28 - Wednesday, August 4
10:00 - 12:00

1. Evaluation of Student Progress - Dr. Russell French

2. Student Behavior or Behavioral Modification - Dr. Robert Williams

3. Student Teaching - Dr. William Butefish

4. Reading (diagnosing and skill sequence) - Dr. Leonard Breen

5. Staff Utilization - Dr. Everett Myer

6. Materials Development - A different consultant will be available each day.

   Dr. Kamala Anandam - Contracts

   Mrs. Louise Chamberlain - Language Arts

   Dr. Charles Chance - Independent Study

   Dr. A. M. Johnston - Individualized Study Plans

   Mr. Carl Ross - Learning Centers

   Mrs. Brenda Smith - Language Arts

   Mr. Bill LaForge - Mounting Pictures

7. Self Instructional Modules
   (Programmed Multi-Media Materials)

   A. Use of audiovisual equipment
   B. Philosophy of education
   C. Preparation of instructional objectives
   D. Research literacy
   E. Organizing the classrooms and school for learning
   F. Professional behavior of teachers
   G. Use of library
   H. Planning for teaching

INTERIM REPORT

June 12, 1972 - June 23, 1972

SUBMITTED TO:

Peter H. Cohan, Executive Director
of
Center for In-Service Education
156 Adams Lane
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

June 1972

E V A L U A T I O N

Hayden Wilson

I. INTRODUCTION

This interim report is submitted in compliance with the provisions for evaluation outlined in the revised edition (May 22, 1972) of "A Proposal for Staff and Program Development Farragut School." This document consitiutes an on-going evaluation of the activities outlined in the proposal. Since only one of the three workshops has been completed at this writing, this report is incomplete and lacks much of the detail of the final evaluation. Thus, it is designed to provide only preliminary feedback on the activities of the workshops and on the evaluation strategies which will be utilized to report these activities.

The evaluation was undertaken on three workshops conducted on site at the Farragut Primary, Middle, and High Schools. Participants from all three schools engaged in workshop activities six hours per day (8:30 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.) for a period of two weeks (June 12 - June 23). The Primary and Middle Schools will return for an additional week of workshop activities August 14 - August 18. No further activities are provided for the High School participants.

A total of fifty-one teachers, one teacher's aid and two principals attended the three workshops. Sixteen attended the Primary School activities, 20 attended the Middle School portion, and 19 participated in the High School activities. In addition, eight members of the High School English staff will work for five days from June 26 - June 30. This is the only time in which the department as a whole could meet together to develop curriculum based on a skills continum.

The workshop participants were volunteers from the staffs of the Farragut Primary, Middle, and High Schools. They were paid fifteen dollars per day for their participation. Twenty-five of the fifty-one participants attended last year's workshop. Five of this year's participants had been hired during the past year.

II. INDIVIDUAL WORKSHOP EVALUATIONS

PRIMARY: Evaluation Strategies

Workshop Objectives

Since the objectives of this workshop are oriented toward curriculum development rather than the assimilation of a body of content, the impetus of this evaluation must necessarily lie in the products which are actually developed and in the extent to which the achievements of these workshops are implemented in the classroom. Accordingly, four strategies will be employed in the final evaluation.

1. Examination and description of the changes, strategies, and materials actually developed in accordance with the workshop objectives: This interim report provides only a brief summary of these products. The final report will include a more extensive summary as well as a compilation of the materials actually produced. It should also be noted that the Primary School participants have an additional week in August in which to attain the objectives.

Primary School participants have either completed or are in the process of completing all of the four objectives specified in the proposal. A continuum of skills has been developed in both science and social studies. Teaching materials are being developed to provide for the individualization

of instruction in attaining these skills. Teachers have met in teams to plan for the utilization of these developments in the coming year. In addition, participants have examined the reading skillogram and have decided to implement it.

2. Questionnaire administered at the close of the workshop in August: This instrument will include both semantic differential and open-ended items. It will obtain participant feedback on workshop activities, organization, and consultative services. It will also contain items on the extent to which the participants feel that objectives were met, the degree of impact that the workshop will have on their classrooms, and the degree to which they intend to utilize the workshop products.

3. Questionnaire administered at the close of the first two weeks of the workshop on June 23 (see Appendix A): This instrument utilizes five open-ended items designed to obtain feedback which will be useful in improving the final week of the workshop. The responses to each item have been collapsed into several broad categories and the approximate percentages of participants who gave each type of response have been calculated. Since many individuals gave several responses while others gave none, the percentages are not cumulative. See Table I for the results.

4. Questionnaire administered in May of the coming school year: This form will allow the teachers who participated in the workshop to indicate the impact which the proceedings of this workshop actually made upon their classroom. Though this instrument will not be administered prior to the completion of the final report, it should provide information valuable to future workshops.

Consultative Services

A total of four consultants aided in the first two weeks of the Primary School workshop. Since the emphasis of their services was upon guiding the teachers in upgrading their own program rather than on instruction in a specific body of content, it was deemed impractical to test participants to access learning. Rather, an instrument (see Appendix B) was developed to solicit the perceptions of the teachers themselves on the facilitative effects of the consultants. The instrument contained two open-ended and five semantic differential type items. Each of the five semantic differential items was constructed on a seven point scale.

The results of the evaluations of the consultants have not been tabulated at this point. The final evaluation will provide a breakdown of each consultant's scores on the individual items of the semantic differential scale, the mean semantic differential score for each consultant, and a summary of the responses of the participants to the open-ended questions.

TABLE I

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN AT CLOSE OF FIRST TWO WEEKS OF PRIMARY WORKSHOP

1. What was one of the best aspects of the first two weeks of the workshop?

60%	Materials and help in setting up learning centers by two learning center consultants
42%	Getting ideas and being able to put them to use by actually making items for classroom use
17%	New ideas for materials
8%	Setting up science and social studies curriculum

2. What was one of the worst aspects of the first two weeks?

75%	Not enough materials
25%	Everything was useful
8%	Unable to agree on social studies curriculum one morning
8%	Going too fast

3. What topics or objectives should be pursued in the final week?

75%	Setting up learning centers or working in own area on materials that can be used in the coming school year
58%	Team planning
8%	Working on rules of the school

4. How could we make the final week more productive?

58%	Let teams work on materials and organization for the opening of school, or let individuals work alone if they wish
42%	Have materials ready
8%	Not schedule anything
8%	Require that all team members be present
8%	Have helpers

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

5. Comments?

75% of the participants answered this question. The following comments were given:

"I feel that it was well planned."

"Best workshop to date."

"Approved!"

"Very good workshop!"

"The workshop has been very helpful."

"These were two of the most helpful weeks I've ever experienced in a workshop."

"The best workshop yet."

"Been most helpful!"

"Most valuable workshop!!!"

MIDDLE SCHOOL: Evaluation Strategies

Workshop Objectives

Because of the similarity of the Primary and the Middle School workshops, the evaluation of the Middle School utilized the same four strategies which were developed for the Primary School.

1. Examination and description of the changes, strategies, and materials actually developed in accordance with the workshop objectives: This interim report provides only a brief summary of these products. The final report will include a more extensive summary as well as a compilation of the materials actually produced. The Middle School participants will also return for an additional week in August.

Based on the skills continum developed in the Primary School, the Middle School social studies department developed a continum for grades four through eight. Each level is composed of four major units. The fourth and fifth grades are to be taught together with one block of curriculum. The goals, overall objectives, behavioral objectives (skills), and learning experiences for the coming academic year has been completed for these two levels. The sixth grade level is also complete with goals, concepts, and activities. One of the four units for the seventh level and one of the four units for the eighth level are complete.

The science department has completed a skills continum for grades four through eight. Concepts, objectives, and activities to be used in learning centers have been developed for levels seven and eight. Concepts and objectives have been developed for the fifth and sixth grade levels. Participants are in the process of developing activities for the learning centers for the fifth and sixth grades. An exploratory program to be

used in conjunction with the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) curriculum has been adopted for the fourth grade. This curriculum stresses skills such as observing, hypothesizing, and inferring rather than content orientation.

The language arts department has developed a very extensive skills continum and is working on appropriate activities.

2. Questionnaire administered at the clo se of the workshop in August: Same as for Primary School.

3. Questionnaire administered at the close of the first two weeks of the workshop on June 23 (see Appendix A): The responses to each item have been collapsed into several broad categories and the approximate percentages of participants who gave each type of response have been calculated. Since many individuals gave several responses while others gave none, the percentages are not cumulative. See Table II for the results.

4. Questionnaire administered in May of the coming school year: Same as for Primary School.

Consultative Services

This data will be evaluated in the same fashion as the Primary School data. A complete report will be given in the final evaluation.

TABLE II

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN AT CLOSE OF FIRST TWO WEEKS OF MIDDLE SCHOOL WORKSHOP

1. What was one of the best aspects of the first two weeks of the workshop?

53%	The consultative services
53%	Freedom to work on materials which can be used in the classroom
47%	The time spent at the primary school with the learning center consultants
13%	Development of skills continum
13%	Congenial and informal atmosphere
7%	Timing - immediately following school when problems are fresh on the mind

2. What was one of the worst aspects of the first two weeks?

27%	Needed more time with the consultants
14%	Lack of materials

Other feelings which were expressed by different individuals were: Not knowing what was expected. Working on units which I won't use since they were for another grade level. Some members of the teams weren't present. Not enough time. Uncertainty about how will be able to carry out units which they have written. The middle school group was tuned out by the consultant when they were combined with the primary group. All work was beneficial.

3. What topics or objectives should be pursued in the final week?

94%	Continue on present projects, tying it all together, organizing the teams, making decisions on schedules, subjects to teach, and acquisition of materials
7%	Have consultants available to give ideas on improving the ideas formulated in this workshop

4. How could we make the final week more productive?

60%	Allow teachers to work in areas that they will be teaching in, completing work, finishing planning, and developing schedules

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

27% Have plenty of materials available

13% Have someone available to aid in scheduling

5. Comments?

53% of the respondents answered this question. The following comments were given:

"Good workshop overall."

"I liked it."

"I have accomplished much more this two weeks than I did last summer..."

"This has been an interesting two weeks. I believe we have accomplished our primary goal and have a small beginning on our secondary goal... I believe we have a better understanding of the concepts of the Middle School and ways of implementing them."

"Workshop rates A plus over last summer - Need I say more??"

"I really enjoyed working in this way."

"This has been a good work week. I've needed this time and more."

"I feel this workshop has been most beneficial."

HIGH SCHOOL: Evaluation Strategies

Workshop Objectives

Because so few teachers signed up for the High School workshop, modifications were made in the objectives and scheduling presented in the proposal. The only department which was able to meet together as a group was English. The only dates which they could meet together were June 26 - June 30. Consequently, at the writing of this report, their work is still in progress.

Since the other departments did not meet together as a whole, the original objectives based upon the development of a contimum of skills in each subject matter area were deleted and individuals were instructed to work on objectives of their own choosing which were related to the development of curriculum for the coming year. A form (see Appendix C) was given out at the onset of the workshop asking for the objectives of each participant. Three strategies were developed for the evaluation of this workshop:

1. Examination and description of the changes, strategies, and materials actually developed. This interim report provides only a brief summary of these products. The final report will include a more extensive summary as well as a compilation of the materials actually produced.

Two Biology teachers participated in the workshop. One of these developed the course content and objectives for six nine-week courses. These courses are Human Body, Genetics and Developmental Biology, Adaptation (Animal Behavior and Structural Adaptations), Ecology, Plant Kingdom, and Animal Kingdom. Only the course in the plant kingdom is partially incomplete (needing the help of a Botanist). This teacher also made a laboratory videotape for use in teaching lab techniques to her students.

The other Biology teacher developed and organized a one-year course, compiling lesson plans and classroom activities, researching specific areas of content, and compiling a set of reference texts and materials.

Another participant organized next year's Physics and General Science curriculum including laboratory experiments and demonstrations. He also used this time period to locate and become familiar with the equipment that is available for Physics and General Science, and "read numerous resource materials for more background information and for reference material for later use."

Working together, two Home Economics teachers developed a semester Family Planning course, and worked out a nine through twelve sequence in the area of Family Living with emphasis on sexual maturity and the changing roles of the individual. They also developed a sequence for the presentation of foods and nutrition materials at different levels from nine through twelve, and worked on nine week units in this area. They formulated recommendations for boy's Home Economics, and are still working on nine week units for eleventh and twelfth grade Child Development and Family Living curriculum.

In mathematics, materials to be used in the coming year were organized, an overall lesson plan with objectives was set up, and Geometry and Algebra contest materials were worked out. Mathematics texts, curriculum guides, and other materials were reviewed. Topics in each math course scheduled to be taught in the coming year from pre-Algebra to advanced math were standardized. A trip to U.T. was made to discuss innovations in course offerings and math methods.

During the one week that he attended, the social studies teacher reorganized materials previously utilized into specific nine week segments,

obtained additional information in the area of state and local government, and eliminated some of the material concerning national government. He also began looking for information on nine week courses in comparative religions and ethnic, and hopes to be able to teach one of these courses spring semester.

In band, a new course in music theory was planned and constructed. A workable plan to cope with the problem of overbalanced instrumentation in band was also developed.

The two business teachers worked together to develop six nine week courses for typing I. The titles are: Fundamentals, Personal, Basic Vocational, Intermediate Vocational, Advanced Vocational, and Typewriting Office Skills. These courses will be implemented during the coming year. They also developed in rough draft form a nine week course for Income Tax and an Introduction to Social Security.

2. Questionnaire (see Appendix D) administered at the close of the workshop June 23 (except for the English department): This form includes likert type items and open-ended questions. Responses to the semantic differential items are given in Table III. Responses to the open-ended items are summarized in Table IV, together with the approximate percentages of participants giving each of these types of responses.

3. Questionnaire administered in May of the coming year: Same as for Primary and Middle Schools.

TABLE III

RESPONSE TO THE LIKERT TYPE ITEMS
ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN AT THE CLOSE OF THE
WORKSHOP JUNE 23 TO THE HIGH SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS

1. Should there have been more structure, less structure, or was this arrangement satisfactory?

   80% Satisfactory

   20% More structure

2. Do you feel that you were able to develop materials which can be used during the next school year?

   90% Very much

   10% Some

3. Do you intend to utilize these materials?

   90% Very much

   10% Some

4. Reviewing the accomplishments of the workshop as a whole, has it been a productive experience?

   80% Very much

   20% Some

5. Were you able to meet the objectives which you set for yourself at the beginning of the workshop?

   80% Most of them

   20% All of them

TABLE IV

RESPONSES TO THE OPEN-ENDED ITEMS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE GIVEN AT THE CLOSE OF THE WORKSHOP JUNE 23 TO HIGH SCHOOL PARTICIPANTS

1. What was one of the best aspects of this workshop?

70%	The opportunity to work on individual projects and on materials which will be of use in the classroom
30%	Flexibility, lack of structure
20%	The opportunity to work with consultants

2. What was one of the worst aspects of this workshop?

20%	Preorganization of the workshop regarding information to the participant
20%	No really bad aspect
20%	Too few of the teaching staff were involved
10%	Difficulty of obtaining resource material
10%	Not enough structure
10%	Should have been closer to the beginning of the fall school term

3. What topics or objectives should be pursued in future workshops or in-service training sessions?

30%	More of the same type of workshop
20%	Participants should work on areas which he feels are important

Other types of comments were: Independent study implementation. Techniques for leading and encouraging class discussion. Conduct workshop by subject matter area or department. Continue nine week development of courses. Improve courses which we have developed.

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

4. What could be changed to make future workshops more productive than this one?

30% This type was satisfactory - needed at this point in the work at Farragut

20% More involvement of the teaching staff is needed

Other types of comments were: Others of the same type. Conduct workshop by subject area or department. Need someone available throughout the workshop who is proficient in H.S. curriculum to answer many little questions that come up. Periodic progress reports regarding objectives.

5. General comments about the workshop?

80% of the respondents answered positively to this question. The following responses were given:

"I like the time selected for this workshop. The closing of the school year is an ideal time..."

"Very useful for me."

"... without the commitment (the workshop) I would have lacked much of the detail and depth (in planning) I have achieved."

"This workshop was very beneficial."

"Most practical kind of workshop."

"Very good."

"Good."

"Very satisfactory."

The responses of the other 20% were:

"Last year's workshop was excellent. I feel as if we could have had more of our staff involved and a few speakers and a few small group people it would have been profitable. A combination of structure vs non-structure."

"I assume that the purpose of a workshop is to encourage innovation. This type is fine for those who are already willing, but I don't believe it is of much help to the others."

APPENDIX A

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The following questionnaire is one of our primary sources of information about your reactions to this workshop and your suggestions for the next workshop. It is very important to us that the following information is completed. Whether changes in future workshops will be based on your comments. Your frank and honest observations in helping us design a better workshop will be greatly appreciated.

1. What was one of the best aspects of the first two weeks of the workshop?

2. What was one of the worst aspects of the first two weeks?

3. What topics or objects should be pursued in the final week?

4. How could we make the final week more productive?

5. Comments?

APPENDIX B

June 12, 1972

EVALUATION OF CONSULTANTS

The following questionnaire is our primary source of feedback on reactions to the consultative services provided in this workshop. The selection of personnel to aid in future workshops will be based on your responses.

How would you rate the last consultant?

1. Knowledge of subject matter?

   very poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 excellent

2. Ability to communicate his (her) knowledge to you?

   very poor 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 excellent

3. Material presented?

   useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 valuable

4. Willingness to help you?

   seldom 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 always

5. Would you like to work with this consultant again?

   not if I can help it 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very much

6. What did you like most about your experience with this consultant?

7. What did you like least?

Comments?

APPENDIX C

June 12, 1972

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of this workshop we need some standard against which to compare each individual accomplishments. However, since each group and each individual has their own goals it is not appropriate for standards to be imposed. Therefore, at the start of the workshop each participant should state the objectives which he (she) hopes to accomplish in this one week period. These objectives are not intended to be immutable. If you wish they may be altered at any time during the course of the workshop.

1.

2.

3.

4.

APPENDIX D

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

The following questionnaire is one of our primary sources of information about your reactions to this workshop and your accomplishments during the workshop. It is very important to us that the following information is accurate. Further changes in future workshops will be based on your answers. Your frank and honest cooperation in helping us design a better workshop will be greatly appreciated.

I. The High School workshop was very unstructured in the sense that participants were able to write their own objectives and pursue these objectives with a minimum of consultative services.

1. Should there have been more structure, less structure, or was this arrangement satisfactory?

_____ More structure
_____ Satisfactory
_____ Less Structure

2. Do you feel that you were able to develop materials which can be used during the next school year?

_____ Very much
_____ Some
_____ Not very much
_____ Not at all

3. Do you intend to utilize these materials?

_____ Very much
_____ Some
_____ Not very much
_____ Not at all

4. Reviewing the accomplishments of the workshop as a whole, has it been a productive experience?

_____ Very much
_____ Some
_____ Not very much
_____ Not at all

5. Were you able to meet the objectives which you set for yourself at the beginning of the workshop?

_____ All of them
_____ Most of them
_____ Some of them
_____ None of them

II.

1. What was one of the best aspects of this workshop?

2. What was one of the worst aspects of this workshop?

3. What topics or objectives should be pursued in future workshops or in-service training sessions?

4. What could be changed to make future workshops more productive than this one?

5. General comments about the workshop?

III. The final evaluation of this workshop must include an enumeration and description of the materials and organizational strategies which have been developed during this two week period. Therefore, we need for each participant to list his accomplishments in this workshop. Please see either Hayden Wilson or Priscilla White prior to turning this form in.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.